

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 26, 2005. New Claims 42 to 75 are pending in the application, of which Claims 42, 50, 58 to 60, 67, 74 and 75 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 6, 8, 9, 11, 13 to 18, 20, 21, 23, 25 to 28, 30 to 34, 36 to 39 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,798,530 (Buckley). Claims 7, 12, 19, 24, 29, 35 and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buckley and U.S. Patent No. 5,815,764 (Tomory). Claims 10 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buckley and U.S. Patent No. 6,452,689 (Srinivisan).

The present invention, as claimed in Claims 42, 50, 58 and 59, concerns a print process in which, based on a maximum value of a capability of a function of each of plural print apparatuses and a print environment of print data, maximum values of the capabilities of the functions of the selected print apparatuses are added together to set a renewal maximum value. Therefore, when the plural print apparatuses are selected, the capabilities of the functions of the selected print apparatuses are added together and it is possible to maximize the use of the capabilities of the selected print apparatuses. In other words, it is possible to eliminate using only the maximum capability of a single print apparatus, thereby forcing a user has to issue the print indication again and again to process a print job, although a plurality of print apparatuses are usably connected but under utilized.

Buckley, Tomory and Srinivasan neither disclose nor suggest, neither alone nor in combination, at least the features of the present invention that the maximum values of the

capabilities of the functions of the plural print apparatuses are added together to set the renewal maximum value and that the renewal maximum value is used for the print process. In light of the deficiencies of the cited art, Applicant submits that Claims 42, 50, 58 and 59 are in condition for allowance and Applicant respectfully requests same.

In another aspect of the present invention, as claimed in Claims 60, 67, 74 and 75, the print process, based on the capability of the function of each of the plural print apparatuses and the print environment of the print data, the capabilities of the functions of the selected print apparatuses are combined together to set a renewal capability. Moreover, the print data is subjected to a dispersion print based on the renewal capability. By such a construction, when the plural print apparatuses are selected, the capabilities of the functions of the selected print apparatuses are combined together, whereby it is possible to increase the degree of freedom of setting of print attributes. Moreover, the print data is subjected to the dispersion print for the print apparatuses according to the respective print attributes, whereby it is possible to obtain a print result exceeding the maximum capability of a single print apparatus. In other words, it is possible to eliminate the situation where only the maximum capability of a single print apparatus is used although plural print apparatuses are useably connected, thereby forcing a user to issue the print indication again and again to process the job of the print data.

Buckley, Tomory and Srinivasan neither disclose nor suggest, neither alone nor in combination, at least the features of the present invention that the capabilities of the functions of the plural print apparatuses are combined together to set the renewal capability and that the print data is subjected to the dispersion print by using the renewal capability for the purpose of the print process. In light of the deficiencies of the cited art, Applicant submits that Claims 60, 67, 74 and 75 are in condition for allowance and Applicant respectfully requests same.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Frank L. Cire', with a horizontal line drawn underneath it.

Frank L. Cire
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 42,419

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 95357v1